## TY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

# NNING BOARD

ANNEX, 57 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE

#### NOTICE OF DECISION

Major Amendment #1

Case No.:

#35

Premises:

Ten Canal Park

Zoning District:

Business A/PUD 4

Petitioner:

Aspen Technology, Inc.

Original PUD Planning Board Decision: October 18, 1983

Major Amendment #1 Application Date: September 21, 1992

Public Hearing and Decision: October 20, 1992

Decision: GRANTED with conditions

#### Petition

Under Section 10.45 of the Zoning Ordinance the applicant requests a variance to replace the previous tenant's logo with the new tenant's logo. The current sign ordinance does not allow signage at the requested height (ca. 67 feet). The Ordinance limit is twenty feet. The sign will not be illuminated.

#### Documents Submitted

Application, certified complete on September 21, 1992, with 1. three illustrations of the proposed sign and location of the sign, dated May 13, 1992.

### Discussion

David Vickery, of Reynolds, Vickery, Messina, & Griefen, Inc. representing Aspen Technology, Inc. presented the proposal for a sign at Ten Canal Park. The proposal consists of placing the Aspen Technology logo on the facade of the building facing Land Boulevard; the height would be sixty-seven (67) feet. of the sign would be 40 square feet. The logo would consist of metal painted gold. The logo of the previous tenant, located on the facade facing the Lechmere Canal has been removed.

Mr. Vickery indicated that as many employees from out of town come to the building to attend classes and seminars, it is important for those employees to be easily able to identity the building.

#### Findings

- 1. The Planning Board finds that the requested logo is as much ornamentation as sign, and if ornamentation would be permitted without restriction. As such the logo will have meaning only for employees in the company and will not appear as a recognizable sign for most other persons.
- 2. The size of the proposed sign is two-thirds (2/3) the maximum size allowed for a wall sign under the present ordinance. The sign would not be illuminated, nor would it face any residential uses. In general, the sign will have very modest impact on its surrounding environment.

#### Decision

Based on the above findings the Planning Board <u>GRANTS</u> the Major Amendment for a variation from the height requirements of the sign ordinance, to permit the erection of a sign as described in the application documents referenced above, subject to the following limitation.

1. The variance is limited to the particular design presented in the application documents.

Voting in favor were P. Dietrich, H. Salemme, A. Callaghan, H. Russell, A. Cohn, C. Mieth, and V. Mathias.

For the Planning Board,

Paul Dietrich, Chairman

A copy of this decision shall be filed with the Office of the City Clerk. Appeals is any shall be made pursuant to Section 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws and shall be filed within twenty (20) days of such filing in the Office of the City Clerk.

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of the decision filed with the Office of the City Clerk on Malenfant, authorized representative of the Cambridge Planning Board. All plans referenced in the decision have likewise been filed with the City Clerk on such date.

Twenty (20) days have elapsed since the filing of this decision. No Appeal has been filed.

City Clerk, City of Cambridge

Date